

## **REMARKS**

Claims 2-4 have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §112 as being indefinite with specific reference to claim 2 as it "does not appear to have that the axial shaft has left and right pins".

Claim 2 has been cancelled with claim 1 amended to include the limitations of claim 2, and further amended to delete the term "an anchored member" having substituted therefore the term "an axial shaft". Additionally, claim 3 has been amended to now be dependent from claim 1.

With these amendments it is believed that the Examiner's objection under 35 USC § 112 has been overcome.

Claim 1 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Schepis.

With claim 1 amended, as mentioned above, to include the limitations of cancelled claim 2, it is believed that claim 1 is no longer anticipated by Schepis.

Claim 5 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious from Schepis in view of Bates; and claim 6 has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being obvious from the same two reference and further in view of Mercat.

Since claim 5 is dependent from claim 1 and claim 6 is dependent from claim 5, and amended claim 1 is no longer anticipated by Schepis, and given the Examiner's rejection of claims 5 and 6 are not obvious from Schepis alone.

For claim 5 to be obvious from the combination of Schepis and Bates, Bates must

show or suggest the limitations of former claim 2 that have been amended into claim 1. From a reading of Bates, no showing or suggestion of the limitations that have been herein added to claim 1 could be found. Therefore claim 5 is in condition for allowance.

Similarly, for claim 6 to be obvious from the combination of Schepis, Bates and Mercat, Mercat must show or suggest the limitations of former claim 2 that have been amended into claim 1. From a reading of Mercat, no showing or suggestion of the limitations that have been herein added to claim 1 could be found. Therefore claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has also stated that "claims 2-4 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome that rejection under 35 USC § 112 ... and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims."

Since the limitations of claim 2 have been added to claim 1 with claim 2 being cancelled, and claim 3 amended to be dependent from claim 1 and claim 4 remaining dependent from claim 3, claims 3 and 4 are now in condition for allowance.

All of claims 1 and 3-6 having been shown to now be in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested the the application now be allowed.

Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jui-Tien Chen

by

Allston L. Jones  
Reg. No. 27,906

Peters, Verny, Jones, Schmitt and Aston, LLP  
425 Sherman Ave., Suite 230  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Voice: 650/324-1677 (Mail Box 105)  
FAX: 650/324-1678  
e-mail: [ajones888@earthlink.net](mailto:ajones888@earthlink.net)  
December 16, 2005